

Richard Knott – Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 – 4 November 2016

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide evidence in relation to the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 (**2016 Guidelines**).
2. I initially became involved with this project in February 2015, when I assisted QLDC with the identification of appropriate boundaries for the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) in Arrowtown. Since September 2015 I have been assisting with the revision/update of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines.
3. In my evidence, I address three matters:
 - (a) the workability of the Old and New Town Chapter in the 2016 Guidelines;
 - (b) the Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay (**Transition Overlay**) that is proposed in response to submissions on the MDRZ, with a matter of discretion being consistency with Arrowtown's character, and utilising the 2016 Guidelines as a guide; and
 - (c) the different approach in the Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**) to submissions seeking that development be sympathetic to its surroundings.
4. In relation to the workability of the Old and New Town Chapter in the 2016 Guidelines, the creation of this combined chapter (compared to the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006) is in part a response to my own concerns regarding:
 - (a) the 'accessibility' and complexity of the 2006 Guidelines, and
 - (b) the inability to simply incorporate additional guidelines for the MDRZ, which has a direct boundary with the Arrowtown Residential Heritage Management Zone (**ARHMZ**), into the 2006 Guidelines.
5. The intention of the change has been to create a logical, easy to follow document that enables designers to bring forward developments which are sympathetic to the character of Arrowtown.
6. Whilst I recognise Mr Blakely's (28) concerns, I believe that the 2016 Guidelines have more than overcome the shortcomings of the 2006 Guidelines for the following reasons:

- (a) the overall document is over 20% shorter;
 - (b) its structure is now more readily accessible and understandable;
 - (c) there is less duplication;
 - (d) combining the 'Old Town' and 'New Town' sections of the 2006 Guidelines has allowed the required amendments for the proposed MDRZ to be simply integrated into the 2016 Guidelines, and read within the context of the requirements for the other zones; and
 - (e) the use of colour to highlight different provisions to confirm which area they relate to allows users of the 2016 Guidelines to very easily identify relevant requirements.
7. I believe that the 2016 Guidelines represent a logical, easy to follow document which ensures that users gain a wider understanding of the design and layout matters relevant to the whole of Arrowtown. They are then able to use this understanding to inform the design of their own scheme in accordance with the 2016 Guidelines.
8. The proposed alterations to Section 4.8 of the Guidelines, as set out in the evidence of Mr Bryce, clarifies that it is the intention to only encourage some of the characteristics of the Old Town cottage style within the MDRZ and LDRZ, rather than replicate this style throughout the area.
9. In relation to the Transition Overlay, given the potential for a development within the MDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ, I consider that it is beneficial for all developments within that part of the MDRZ closest to the boundary with the ARHMZ to be considered against the 2016 Guidelines. I therefore support the approach outlined in the s42A Hearing Report for Chapter 8 Medium Density Residential Development to include the Transition Overlay in the PDP.
10. As the potential for a development within the LDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ is low, I do not believe that it is necessary to introduce a transition overlay area within the LDRZ in Arrowtown. I therefore support the approach outlined in the s42A Hearing Report for Chapter 7 Low Density Residential Development to not have a Transition Overlay in the LDRZ.